

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 have been allowed. Claims 14 and 17 are rejected. Claims 15 and 16 are objected to. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10 and 14 are independent. Claims 14 and 16 are amended.

Telephonic Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview of June 25, 2008, in which changes to the claims that might result in patentability were discussed. Applicants express dismay that the facsimile sent to the USPTO on June 25, 2008, was never delivered to the Examiner. This Office action response amends the claims in the fashion that the Examiner indicated would probably result in allowance. As language from Claim 15 has been lifted into claim 14, no new matter has resulted from this action.

Cited Art

The Office action (“Action”) applies the following cited art: U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0035470 to Gao et al. (“Gao”).

§ 102 Rejection

The Action rejects claims 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gao. Applicants traverse.

The action objects to claims 15 and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, independent claim 14, but otherwise allowable if they were rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (Action, page 2.) Independent claim 14 has been amended to substantially incorporate the language of dependent claim 15. As amended, independent claim 14 recites a method for creating a pseudo time domain signal to switch the coding from lapped transform based codec to time domain codec for one or more particular frames, the method comprising, in part:

wherein applying a lapped transform and its inverse transform on the windowed frame to generate a pseudo time domain signal comprises performing a matrix multiplication with the windowed frame.

Independent claim 14 should now be allowable over the prior art. Dependent claims 16 and 17 are allowable at least because they depend from independent claim 14. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejections and allowance of claims 14, 16, and 17.

Request for Interview

If any issues remain, the Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney prior to issuance of the next Office action in order to arrange a telephonic interview. It is believed that a brief discussion of the merits of the present application may expedite prosecution. Applicants submit the foregoing formal Amendment so that the Examiner may fully evaluate Applicants' position, thereby enabling the interview to be more focused.

This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

Conclusion

The claims should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301
cc: Docketing

By /Genie Lyons/
Genie Lyons
Registration No. 43,841